

## In attendance

---

### CAG Members

Bruce Beaulaurier  
Reid Brockway for Mike Rundle  
Jim Creevey  
Ernie Grillo  
Barbara Justice  
Bente Pasko  
Don Potter  
Peggy Reddy  
Mike Rundle  
Janey Whitt

Jay Willenberg  
Jeremy Zucker

### King County Staff

Gina Auld, Capital Project Manager

### Consultant Team

Jenny Bailey, Parametrix  
Rita Brogan, PRR  
Teresa Gonzales, PRR

### Members of the public

Glen Rolfe, area resident  
Corinna Bolender, guest commuter

## Meeting Summary

---

### I. Discussion of Impacts and Mitigation

The CAG members were asked to discuss the adequacy of the impact evaluation and the proposed mitigation presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The summary of the discussion is organized below by specific topic.

#### State Route 520 Crossing

One CAG member commented that the State had previously contemplated a trail overcrossing of the SR 520 off-ramp, as part of other highway improvements. While that overcrossing is no longer proposed by the State, the City of Redmond and others are still advocating the overcrossing because it would be safer than the at-grade crossing at the signal with Redmond Way.

#### Fencing

Several CAG members expressed concern about the potential impacts from trail fencing, with concerns ranging from:

- The visual (i.e., “dog run”) effects for trail users when chain-link fencing is on both sides of the trail;
- The potential for trail users to run into fencing (e.g., bicycle handle bars) due to its close proximity; and

- Neighbors crossing the trail need adequate site distance between the trail and the fence to see the trail users coming (and vice versa).

The implication of the fencing discussion was that, while King County had considered and identified these impacts, not enough weight had been given to them in the preliminary design.

### Generality of Impact Evaluation

One CAG member felt that the Draft EIS was too general and did not adequately disclose the specific impacts to adjacent property owners. She felt that King County should be able to identify specific impacts, i.e. landscaping, irrigation system, or other property maintained features within the County right of way for each adjacent property owner.

Another CAG member felt that the Draft EIS was ambiguous about the impacts—describing “potential” or “likely” impacts, rather than being conclusive about the specific impacts. He felt that this limited King County’s ability to choose between alternatives.

### Parking

A CAG member expressed concern that the Draft EIS did not adequately identify the loss of neighborhood parking within the railbanked right of way, resulting from a wider trail. If this parking is reduced, visitors in particular could be forced to parallel park along East Lake Sammamish Parkway, introducing other safety concerns such as reduced line of sight for vehicles pulling out on the road.

Several CAG members agreed that parking is a concern. There is some concern that trail users will park in areas not authorized for their use. One CAG member suggested that this is already a concern with the interim trail. Signs should clearly identify where parking is allowed and by whom. The local jurisdiction (e.g., the City of Sammamish) should enforce the parking regulations.

CAG members emphasized that parking and access are big issues. More access points are needed for those who live close enough to walk or bike to the trail (so these access points could be designed without parking and just paths to the ELST). Parking is also needed at intervals along the corridor.

One CAG member noted that the City of Sammamish is considering developing their waterfront land at the north end (north of Bob Hamilton's house but, south of Gary Johnson's (?) house) but lack funding to complete this. It was suggested that a partnership with King County and the City could be entered where they both contribute funding for parking in this area (this would serve the trail and the waterfront park). Note the city's plan includes restrooms in this area.

### **Construction and Permanent Access**

A CAG member noted that, during the construction phase, more access points would be needed than proposed for the permanent trail operation. She suggested that, when these construction access points are negotiated, consideration be given to making the access permanent (i.e., extended to trail operation), or providing other amenities such as parks or benches at these locations.

A CAG member also asked about the wheel washes mentioned in the Draft EIS and intended to reduce the amount of dirt construction vehicles carry onto public roadways from the construction site. The CAG member was concerned about how the dirty water from the wheel wash would be managed.

### **Corridor Management**

A CAG member pointed out that there might be indirect impacts to the trail if the County does not properly manage the parts of the corridor outside the trail footprint.

### **Hours of Operation**

A CAG member clarified that, based on correspondence from King County Parks, trails are considered linear parks and all County parks close from dusk to dawn. However, it is acknowledged that existing trails, such as the Burke-Gilman Trail and Sammamish River Trail, are commonly used before dawn and after dusk. Most CAG members agreed that despite the East Lake Sammamish Trail being closed from "dusk to dawn" for safety reasons, people will continue to use the trail at all hours. Several CAG members agreed that the County needed to reevaluate this policy, given its stated objective to provide commuting alternatives to motorized vehicles.

### **Trail Maintenance**

There was concern raised by a CAG member about trash receptacles and doggy litter bag availability and use. A CAG member has observed the doggy litter bags littering the interim trail, the apparent result of either mischief or poor operation of the receptacle.

### **Culvert Mitigation**

A question was also raised about the number and location of boxed culverts, which would replace existing culverts to allow fish passage.

## **II. Implementation**

This discussion was framed by the three questions below:

*1. Given that the trail would be developed in segments, how should the County prioritize the trail development (i.e., where should the County start)?*

CAG members had a variety of ideas:

- Phasing should begin at the north end from Redmond to Inglewood because the demand was greatest there.
- It would be better to begin at the south end because of the lack of access points and facilities in other areas.
- It would be better to determine usage first and use that to determine the phasing.
- It was more logical to start work at both (i.e., north and south) ends of the trail. As demonstrated on the construction of the interim trail, there are lessons to be learned on the "easier" segments before tackling the more difficult central segment.
- Parking and restrooms should be constructed first to alleviate concerns about current interim trail use and future master plan trail use.
- There was discussion about the County's property at the base of Inglewood Hill Road and the need to develop that as parking/trailhead/restroom area first.

*2. Given that the trail would be designed in segments, what should the public process be during the design of any given segment?*

CAG members agreed that there should be public meetings, and some of the members offered the following specific suggestions:

- The public should be notified well in advance of meetings and special attention should be paid to getting those who are impacted most to attend.
- The County should be prepared to answer community questions. Otherwise, the meetings are not useful.
- More frequent and smaller community meetings would be a good idea.

*3. Is there a role for the CAG?*

- Some CAG members voiced the opinion that if the CAG was helping the County and contributing something valuable they should continue. If not, they should be disbanded.

- Other members felt that the CAG could help establish priorities and criteria for getting things done during the design phase such as saving old trees, safety and helping the County recognize priorities.
- Most CAG members agreed that they needed to be better informed so they could better communicate what is going on to their neighbors and the community. CAG members would like more information earlier and more certainty about what is going on.
- Several members view the CAG as a sounding board for the general community because they represent a lot of diverse groups.

#### What's Next

- *Schedule:*
  - Comments submitted for DEIS (end of 2006)
  - Draft CAG report emailed to members for review (January 2007)
  - One CAG meeting to wrap up comments on draft (January 2007)
  - Biological assessment (first half 2007)
  - Final Environmental Impact Statement (summer of 2007)
    - Responses to CAG comments included
  - Decision (Alternative selected) (fall of 2007)
  - Start design phase (end of 2007-early 2008) for first segment
  - Construction begins (2009) for first segment

Meeting was adjourned.